



**Technical Assistance Services for Communities**  
**Contract No.: EP-W-07-059**  
**TASC WA No.: TASC-4-HQ-OSRTI**  
**Technical Directive No.: 2.02 TD #7 Passaic River**

### **Draft Schedule of Technical Assistance Activities**

The Passaic River Community Advisory Group (CAG) has requested Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) services in developing a list of issues, questions and services that the CAG may like addressed throughout the Passaic River cleanup, along with a schedule for completion of activities associated with these issues, questions and services.

Based on a conference call with the CAG, TASC understands that questions and issues the CAG would like to explore are:

- What is the basis for the different cleanup recommendations from the Cooperative Parties Group (CPGs) and EPA? The CAG would like to understand the different positions and tradeoffs before deciding their opinion on the preferred level of cleanup.
- What are the current risks to human health for recreational use of the Passaic River, as well as the current risk from fish and crab consumption? How will different remedial alternatives affect risk and how quickly will risk change after a cleanup alternative is implemented?
- What is the current ecological risk? How will different remedial alternatives affect ecological risk and how quickly?
- The CAG would like a plain language summary of the Focused Feasibility Study (FFS) to share with other community stakeholders.
- The CAG would like to understand the selected remedial alternatives that are evaluated in the FFS (anticipated to be released in January 2012), including the life cycle impacts of each remedial alternative.

The table below outlines a timeframe for anticipated CAG activities and potential technical assistance associated with these activities.

Timeline	EPA and Agency Activities	Anticipated CAG Activities to Address Questions and Issues	Potential Technical Assistance
2007	Draft FFS Released for the 17 mile tidal portion of the Passaic River and its watershed		<b>Note:</b> CAG should note that the risk assessment in the 2007 draft FFS Appendix C only addresses risk associated with consumption of fish and crab. There is no information about risk to people who use the river for recreational purposes and do not eat the fish or crab. The CAG may want to understand risk for the recreational user, as well as risk from consumption of fish and crab. The CAG may want to ask EPA when this additional risk information will be available to the CAG.
November 2012	Comments due to Remedy Review Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send CAG “position” comments to Remedy Review Board.</li> <li>• Listen to CPGs and EPA to understand ongoing discussions and potential remedial alternatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listen to CPGs and EPA, review pertinent materials and assist CAG with understanding issues and tradeoffs.</li> <li>• Table summarizing other remedial projects across the country similar to Passaic River (including description, remedial and disposal selection (esp. dredging options),</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• results, pilot projects, how this is different from Passaic River, etc.)</li> </ul>
December 2012	Remedy Review Board Meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listen to CPGs and EPA to understand ongoing discussions and potential remedial alternatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listen to CPGs and EPA, review pertinent materials and assist CAG with understanding issues and tradeoffs. Assessment of CPG proposals and potential gaps in the proposal (e.g., limited dredge and capping proposal, modeling)</li> </ul>
January - February 2013	FFS Released for the Lower 8 miles of the Passaic River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the remedial alternatives selected for further evaluation.</li> <li>• Understand the health risks associated with the site for different human activities (recreation, fish consumption, etc.) and potential ecological risks.</li> <li>• Understand and provide input on anticipated future uses and restoration of the site and whether the remedial alternatives allow for these uses and restoration opportunities (this needs to be done concurrently).</li> <li>• Provide EPA with information about the type of cleanup the community is most interested in based on duration, impact and results of cleanup.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review FFS; summarize FFS in plain language; provide technical comments and recommendations to the CAG.</li> <li>• Write summary fact sheets explaining remedial and disposal alternatives evaluated in the FFS, including environmental justice analysis; the gaps in science. knowledge and actual implementation of alternatives (uncertainty and potential risk); provide a qualitative evaluation of the potential long term (life cycle) impacts of each remedial and disposal alternative; opportunities for restoration with selected remedial alternative; recommend documents for community members interested in learning more about the selected remedial alternatives.</li> </ul>

		•	
March 2013	Proposed Plan Released	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide comments on Proposed Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Proposed Plan; provide technical comments and recommendations to the CAG.</li> <li>• Assist with providing comments on the proposed plan, as needed.</li> </ul>